THE MINISTER OF INDUSTRY (SHRi J. VENGAL RAO): (a) Information, to the extent available, will be collected and laid on tbe Table of the Rajya Sabha.

(b) The details of prices fixed in •respect of drugs involved in the Supreme Court case are quite voluminous. Th© time and efforts required for collection of these details would be incommensurate with the results likey to be achieved.

Representations against the fixed prices

3002. SHRI DHULESHWAR MEENA: Will the Minister of INDUSTRY be pleased to refer to the answer to Unstarred Question 2041 given in the Rajya Sabha on the 28th November, 1988 and state;

(a) how many representations against the prices of bulk drugs and formulations fixed in 198? and 193Sl were received;

(b) how many of these representations have been processed and decided so far and what institutional arrangements have been evolved to dispose of such representations;

(c) what is the average time taken in disposing of the representations; and

(d) what are the names of bulk drugs and formulations for which prices were revised after representations and the names of those bulk drugs and formulations for which representations were rejected without any revision in prices?

THE MINISTER OF INDUSTRY (SHRl J. VENGAL RAO): (a) to (d) As the prices of a large number of bulk drugs and formulations were fixed during the years 1987 and 1988, representations/review petitions have been received from many companies in respect of various price fixations. All efforts are made t° dispose of the pending cases (review petitions) as quickly as possible.

Multivitamin case

3003. SHRI DHULESHWAR MEENA; Will the Minister of INDUSTRY be pleased to refer to the answer to Unstarred Question 2068 given in the Rajya Sabha on the 28th November, 1988 and state;

(a) whether it is a fact that his Ministry has filed an appeal in a bench of the Bombay High Court against the judgement of a single judge in respect of multivitamin cases;

(b) if so, when this appeal was filed and what is its status now;

(c) whether it is a fact that certain parties have withdrawn their cases at the instance of his Ministry;

(d) whether it is a fact that M/s. Pfizer gave an undertaking to his Ministry; if so, what are the contents of the undertaking;

(e) whether it is also a fact that certain companies sold vitamin formulations at prices even higher than those to which they were entitled even with 100 per cent MAPE adjustment;

(f) whether his Ministry has worked out unintended benefit; and

(g) if so, what are the details thereof?

THE MINISTER OF INDUSTRY (SHRl J. VENGAL RAO): (a) to (d) Government had Sled an appeal in the year 1987 against the Judgement of the Bombay" High Court dated 23-3-87 in the case of M/s. Sandoz (India) Ltd. and dated 6-4-87 in the case of M/s. Pfizer Ltd. and Mjs. Abbott Labs. (India) Ltd. The appeal was allowed by the High Court in the case of M/s. Sandoz (India) Ltd., on 23-9-1987 and the judgement dated 23-3-87 was quashed and set aside. In other two cases, the concerned companies have subsequently withdrawn the writ petitions filed by them. M/s. Pfizer had also expressed their willingness to implement the revised prices